REMARKS

Although Applicant contends that the specification clearly describes the list structure,

independent claims 1, 16, 21, and 25 have been amended to more clearly describe the claimed

invention. Support for this clarification is found in ¶¶ 21, 22, and 24, as well as Table 1 on p. 13.

Also, claim 19 has been amended to correct a typographical error in dependency. None of the

changes add new matter or require a new search, as the amended elements were already well

described and supported in the application as originally filed.

I. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2

Claims 7, 14, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2 as lacking antecedent basis.

Claims 7, 14, and 19, as amended, no longer lack antecedent basis, and applicant requests that

each claim now be allowed.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1 and 13-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by

Otterness et al. (Otterness). Claims 1-12, 14, 16-23, 25-27, and 29-30 also stand rejected under

35 U.S.C. §102(e), as being anticipated by Masubuchi et al. (Masubuchi). Applicant respectfully

requests reconsideration of the rejection.

A. Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 contains the element "wherein said list structure is located outside the cache"

which is not present in Otterness. Although the rejection states, "Figure 3, cld_type is located in

CLD in Reference 204, which is outside of cache Reference 210," the cld_type is located within

another cache, Reference 204. Otterness teaches a caching structure within a system having

multiple processors, each with an associated interface and cache memory. Otterness, Col. 7,

lines 26-32. Reference 204 in Figure 3 also corresponds to Reference 104 in Figure 2, and is

explicitly described as a cache. Otterness, Col. 7, lines 37-38 ("data must be copied between the two caches 110, 104"). As Otterness does not contain a "list structure outside the cache" as required by claim 1, Otterness does not support a rejection under §102(e).

In addition, claim 1, as amended, requires that the list structure not contain cache data or addresses while the Cache Line Descriptors (CLDs) of Otterness contains both cache data and addresses. Otterness, Figure 5; Table 1. In fact, the variable cld_type, located within the CLD, is essentially equivalent to a dirty bit, rather than a list structure as defined and claimed by the present invention. Otterness, Table 1; Col. 12, lines 12-13.

B.   Dependent Claims 13-14

Claims 13-14 depend from claim 1, and contain each element of claim 1. As claim 1 is allowable, dependent claims 13-14 must also be allowed.

C.   Independent Claims 1, 16, 21, and 25

Claims 1, 16, 21, and 25, as amended, require a list structure that does not contain cache data or addresses. Masubuchi stores addresses in each embodiment of the cache flash device, and thus does not read on the claims of the present invention. *See e.g.*, Masubuchi, Figure 1, Reference 32, Col. 11, lines 16-17. As the cited reference does not contain each element of claims 1, 16, 21, and 25, it cannot support a rejection under §102(e). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection.

D.   Dependent Claims 2-12, 14, 17-20, 22-23, 26-27, and 29-30

Claims 2-12, 14, 17-20, 22-23, 26-27, and 29-30 depend from claims 1, 16, 21, and 25, and contain each element of the independent claims. As claims 1, 16, 21, and 25 are allowable, claims 2-12, 14, 17-20, 22-23, 26-27, and 29-30 must also be allowed.

III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

A. Dependent Claim 13

Claim 13 depends from claim 1, and contains each element of the independent claim. As claim 1 is allowable, claim 13 must also be allowed.

In addition, even if Masubuchi and Otterness together contained each element of claim 13, which they do not, the rejection fails to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness by neglecting to explicitly point out any teaching to combine the references. Both the MPEP and the courts require such a teaching to support an obviousness rejection.

B. Dependent Claims 15, 24, and 28

Claims 15, 24, and 28 depend from claims 1, 21, and 25, and contain each element of the respective independent claims. As the independent claims are each allowable, dependent claims 15, 24, and 28 must also be allowed.

Applicant respectfully contends that Masubuchi does not read on the independent claims and contain each claim element, and thus does not support a rejection of claims 15, 24, and 28. In addition, Applicant respectively traverses the following statements:

> However, it is well know in the art to locate elements in a system on the die with a processor to reduce off chip latency associated with data communications. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to locate the list structure on the die with at least one of the plurality of processors for the desirable purpose of reducing latency.

However, it is well known in the art to check the status of a cache line

during a snoop operation to maintain coherency and thus it would be

obvious to query a table to check the status of a cache line for the desirable

purpose of maintaining data.

Applicant therefore requests affidavits to support these statements, as required by

MPEP §2144.03 and 37. C.F.R. §1.104(d)(2), so that the statements may be contradicted.

CONCLUSION

Request for Allowance

It is believed that this Amendment places the application in condition for allowance, and prompt action on this Amendment is earnestly solicited.

If, in the opinion of the examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees, or credit any overpayments, to Deposit Account No. **11-0600**.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON

Dated: <u>March 21, 2003</u>

By: _____
James F. Feeney
(Reg. No. 45,538)
Attorney for Intel Corporation

KENYON & KENYON
333 West San Carlos St., Suite 600
San Jose, CA 95110

Telephone: (408) 975-7500
Facsimile: (408) 975-7501

42314_1.DOC

- 12 -